The soul of man is the Eternal. It is made of consciousness, it is made of feeling, it is made of the All. The soul is made of this world and of the other world.

—*Brihad Aranyaka Upanishad*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 57 APRIL, 1969 NUMBER 6

AN INTUITED PERCEPTION

IN one of his letters, Mr. Judge gives this counsel: "The right position to take is the wish to BE. For then we know. *The wish to know is almost solely intellectual, and the desire to BE is of the heart.*"

This wisdom goes to the roots of human life. It is no accident that what passes for knowledge in modern civilization is precisely the sort that can be separated from feelings of beinghood. Desire is the principle which is uppermost in the present cycle of human development—desire rationalized and implemented by an intellectuality responsive to externalized longing and the acquisitive impulses of the times.

So it is that the prevailing learned conceptions relate to the appearances, properties, forces, and dynamics of the external world. This knowledge is not without its uses. Desire, after all, has its role in the evolutionary process. But the symmetries of human capacity can hardly manifest according to the sublime ratios of the Heavenly Man while the incarnated host is still in the midst of the fourth round, and during the heyday of fifth sub-race elaborations and rationalizations of lower manas.

Quite naturally, therefore, it is said that theosophists work for the *future*. As Mr. Judge wrote in another place:

> We are working for the new cycles and centuries. What we do now in this transition age will be like what the great Dhyan Chohans did in the transition point—the midway point in evolu-

> tion—at the time when all matter and all types were in a transition and fluid state. They then gave the new impulse for the new types, which resulted later in all the vast varieties of nature. In mental development we are now at the same point; and what we now do in faith and hope for others, and for ourselves, will result similarly on the plane to which it is all directed. . . . Hence we are not working for some definite organization of the new years to come, but for a change in the Manas and Buddhi of the Race. That is why it may seem indefinite, but it is, nevertheless, very defined and very great in scope.

The oppressive scenes of current events—and not only these, but also the scholarly doctrines, the scientific expositions, as well as the "ethics" of leaders concerned with the management of mass human affairs—give us no more than a reading of the great statistical averages of human development in the present. We look out on this vast range of outward effects, while trying as best we can to work on the plane of causes. What is accomplished there comes from the acts of "being" Mr. Judge speaks of, and the effects of such effort, for the present, could not possibly be known except by those with the capacity to look into the hearts of men, able to recognize the hidden growth of their secret strivings.

So the work of students is a lonely task, yet not without its encouragements. For always in the world are those who, even if unknown to themselves, represent the kind of knowledge which comes to men that follow the advice of sages.

"Averages," after all, are never a true picture of the human condition. They give only a statistical version, a smoothed curve which conceals the heights of human achievement. There are men in the world today—a few—who in some measure qualify as wise by Mr. Judge's definition. These men occasionally make themselves heard, and they have their effect. No one can "explain" them in the terms of knowledge now accepted by the world. They are not popular figures, yet they exercise a subtle influence. For never, in any cycle of growth, is the human race without members guided by flashes of intuition. The paths they make into the future may cut no wide swathe, nothing that can be compared to the ruinous policies of nations, nor to the swaying intoxications of fashion or the objective exploits of inventors and engineers. They seldom make headlines, although, by their own channels, against the grain of the times, they share strength and their inspiration. Often enough, they serve as sensitive barometers to the constructive changes in the air, being

able to recognize and to encourage the movement of men's minds in the right direction.

It is possible to discern, today, men working in various branches of the sciences and in education who express in a more limited idiom the truth repeated by Mr. Judge—that the knowing that is of human value comes from *being,* not from the skills of intellectual manipulation. Various such men could be named, but the gist of their discovery concerns the dependence of all true knowledge on the deepening sense of moral identity in human beings. This seems the underlying verity in a wide gamut of new thought, sometimes called Existential, or, more formidably "phenomenological," with such terms as "self-actualization," and "subjectivity" gaining currency in the thought of the times. Then, added to these nascent perceptions, are the findings of teachers who grasp the significance lying behind the surging demands of the younger generation. As one of these teachers, a professor of mathematics, said recently, the young feel that they are cut off from life by the content of their education. What they learn in school does not, we might say, help them to *be.* Following is an account that penetrates the polemical externals of what is happening on the campuses:

> The current world-wide student unrest has its sources in the social and political and religious realms. Much of the protest, however, is simply an expression that the factual and theoretical data taught by the colleges and universities does not tie in with appropriate sensitivities to nature, human problems, man's subconscious or an immanent God. There is a loss of the sense of connection between abstract, objectified material and human experience. As these students tell me, it is not just that the scientific disciplines are hard or demanding, but that *they do not allow one to know and experience the real world.* Indeed, these disciplines often seem to hinder or obscure such experience. Contrast these attitudes with those of many of us who went into the study of the physical sciences because we "knew" they could tell us more about the real world and would allow us a more intelligent and fuller experience of it.

Here, surely, is awareness of a profound change in human attitudes. How this change will work its way to the surface of recognizable events, through multiple forms of individual human decision, it would be difficult now to say, but so widespread a hunger for direct contact with life, for actual being, can hardly be suppressed. Many years ago, Ortega y Gasset wrote perceptively, and in a sense prophetically, of the irrelevance of much in scientific

studies. He said in a concluding chapter of *Mission of the University* (Princeton University Press, 1944):

> . . . culture requires that we possess a complete concept of the world and of man; it is not for culture to stop, with science, where the methods of absolute theoretic rigor happen to end. Life cannot wait until the sciences may have explained the universe scientifically. . . . Science is not something by which we live. If the physicist had to live by the ideas of his science, you may rest assured he would not be so finicky as to wait for some other investigator to complete his research a century or so later. . . .
>
> The internal conduct of science is not a *vital* concern; that of culture is. Science is indifferent to the exigencies of our life, and follows its own necessities. Accordingly, science grows constantly more diversified and specialized without limit, and is never completed.

But it would simplify matters too much to blame all the worries and troubles of the world on "Science." The entire scientific undertaking is hardly more than a vast, objectified symptom of the illusion of separateness—in the form "natural" to it in this round and race—and an illusion, also which has been enormously fortified by the external physical achievements science has made possible and by its capacity to satisfy the demands of desire. Yet Science is no more than the institutionalization of the presently prevailing relationship of the psychic and intellectual principles. As that relationship changes—as other, higher principles come more into play—the idea of man, of nature, and of knowledge will quite naturally, and inexorably if slowly, undergo a corresponding evolution. While this change expresses a law of nature—the law of cycles—extensively outlined and discussed in *The Secret Doctrine,* it will in no sense be independent of man's progress in self-discovery and deliberated choice. *Will,* or self-induced and self-devised effort, must be increasingly the factor in human evolution, as the cycle proceeds. This is the teaching of the Theosophical philosophy, and already, in some measure, the vaguely intuited perception of those men of the race for whom *being* has become a prior reality to "knowing," and who are finding ways to give voice to what is in their hearts.

THE COSMIC CHRIST

THE title Christ, or the Anointed One, given to Jesus in the Gospels, is one which has been applied to his forerunners for centuries, just as the title Buddha, the Enlightened One, has been given to many Buddhas ages before the days of Gautama, Prince Siddartha. The Sanscrit term *Adhi Budha,* the One Supreme Wisdom, was used millenniums before it was humanized and applied to the great Sages and Teachers. So we have on the one hand the human Buddha, and on the other, the Cosmic Buddha; we have the human Jesus, and the Cosmic Christ. For Christ, the true esoteric Saviour, as H. P. Blavatsky points out—

> *is no man,* but the DIVINE PRINCIPLE in every human being. He who strives to resurrect the Spirit *crucified in him by his own terrestrial passions,* and buried deep in the "sepulchre" of his sinful flesh; he who has the strength to roll back the *stone of matter* from the door of his own *inner* sanctuary, he *has the risen Christ in him.* . . . Whether Heathen or Christian by birth they [Theosophists] refuse to materialise and degrade that which is the purest and grandest ideal—the symbol of symbols—namely, the immortal Divine Spirit in man, whether it be called Horus, Krishna, Buddha or Christ.

The study of the origin of the Christian religion has been made purposely obscure by the bigotry and fanaticism of those who, after the first few centuries, built it up into an ecclesiastical system. Fortunately, however, a sufficient number of the early documents and monument inscriptions have survived to yield evidence of the source of the Christian doctrine. Christianity, formed entirely from the molds of older systems, must yield the same esoteric interpretation as they do; and the keys that open the doors to the secrets of the Ancient Mysteries must also unlock those of the Christian scheme.

But what a difference there is between the conceptions of the Christians of the first few centuries and the conceptions which priestcraft has presented to the multitude in the name of their Lord! Are not the words which the Gospels make Jesus say—"Ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye entered not in yourselves and them that were entering in ye hindered"—equally applicable to

those who have monopolized the grand ideal of the Christ, the Universal Spirit of Wisdom, and the Higher Self of every human being? Under the pretence of giving the people a saviour, there has been shut out from their minds the one vital truth that the true Christ lives and dwells in their own hearts. St. Paul's preaching to that effect has fallen on dulled ears, and his epistles in their English translations usually cloud his meaning, though one or two passages would still remain sufficiently clear if preconceived notions did not bar the way to the true meaning. Well might his words to the Galatians be applied to the churches today: "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you? Shall you, who in the beginning looked to the Christ-spirit, now end by believing in a Christ of Flesh?"

It is not our purpose, however, to treat of the Christ from the point of view of the Gospels, but rather to show the identical teaching with regard to the Christ in other great religious systems. It was Ammonius Saccas, the God-taught philosopher of the third century, who, in Alexandria, brought together in his Eclectic Theosophical School all the religions and sects under a common system of ethics and philosophy. So, too, the Theosophist of today is endeavoring to point out that the many streams of identical doctrine in every philosophy and religion must have had a common source; that there was an Ancient Wisdom Religion known to and practiced by the Initiates of every country, race, and era.

When one turns to the recorded lives of the great spiritual teachers, one finds certain fundamental facts narrated of each: their births are of a miraculous and divine order; they are threatened at birth by an opposite power, whether King Herod or King Kansa; they are tempted, persecuted, and finally put to death, whereupon they descend into the underworld and then rise again from the dead.

The mythology is so nearly identical that the observant reader can only conclude that behind the allegories lie certain basic spiritual truths. In other words, the recorded history is the drama of the Soul—its growth and unfoldment. King Mara (or Herod or Kansa) symbolizes this illusionary world of material existence which ever strives to kill the awakening perceptions and obscure the fact that the immaculate birth is not that of the physical body but the mystic birth at initiation.

In the oldest scriptures known to the profane, the *Rig Veda,* is to be found the root type of all these histories. The gnostic gospel of St. John equates the Christ with the Greek Logos, the Word, which

"in the beginning . . . was with God; and the Word was God." This is the Hindu Sabda (Sound) Brahman, the Akasa, or the sounding board of the Universe, from which emanates in its differentiated vibrations the whole manifested Universe. Paul writing to the Colossians of this Cosmic aspect of the Christ, says: "By him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: . . . and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." This, again, is the Logos from whom proceed, in the Kabalistic system, the lower sephiroth, denominated thrones, dominions, etc. It proves that Paul had in mind the doctrine of emanations, and that his Christ was no person.

Esoterically there are three Logoi, and these three are the personified symbols of the three spiritual stages of Evolution. The first is spoken of as the unmanifested potentiality. (Pythagoras speaks of the never-manifested Monad dwelling in solitude and darkness.) From this comes the second Logos, which is the abstract collectivity of creators, called by the Greeks "Demiurgi." These are the Elohim, the gods, spoken of in the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis, who built the model of the new universe out of the pre-existing material.

The third Logos is the differentiation of the second, and the individualization of the Cosmic forces. These are the secondary personal gods of the ancients, synthesized by Brahmâ, or the subjective and objective Universe.

In Buddhist phraseology it is Avalokiteshwara—or in Chinese, Kwan-Shai-Yin—who is the cosmic Logos. Avalokiteshwara is the synthetic aggregate of the Elohim or Dhyan Chohans, the Lords of Meditation. The word does not mean, as Mr. Rhys Davids expresses it, "the Spirit of Buddhas present in the Church," but the Universal Spirit present in the temple of great nature, even as it is equally present in the heart of man. "I am in the hearts of all men," says Krishna, speaking as the Logos in *The Bhagavad-Gita*. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" asks St. Paul.

Who are these entities, then, who play such an important part in the evolutionary scheme? The esoteric philosophy speaks of them as a compound unity of spiritual beings whose duty it is to act the part of Prometheus in the great drama of Life. They are the *manasaputra,* or Sons of Mind in the Hindu system. In the myth of

Prometheus we find the great Titan giving the fire of heaven to mortals, i.e., incarnating in them and lighting the fire of self-conscious mind, or reflective reason—a "sin" for which the sensual Zeus, the lord of the lower heaven, chains Prometheus to a rock (the chains of material existence) where the Titan is tormented by the Vulture of Time and the lower passional elements of Nature until his deliverer comes in the shape of Heracles, the Sun God, the Christ. In clearer terms, the coming down of Prometheus (which corresponds to the Fall of the Angels) is the descent of Spirit into Matter. The spiritual being is first eclipsed by the turbulent elements of matter, then ultimately overcomes and rules those elements. The Angels who fell, the Satans, the Lucifers, the Ahrimans, are so many names for those spiritual beings who are now the sacrificial victims of their lower personal selves. Here, we touch upon the real meaning of crucifixion, the Atonement, and Resurrection, because the drama is a cosmic one and is being enacted by every Son of God incarnated in every Son of Man.

The Cosmic Christ, the "Sun of Wisdom," is the abstract Unity. The individual spiritual beings are the rays of that Sun whose mission it is to redeem Humanity, that is, to make man an Immortal Being. The scriptures of all nations continually point to the grand goal ahead, and, where not directly stated, it is implicit in the teachings. Repeated incarnations on earth are a logical necessity in the reaching of that goal. Even the English translations of the New Testament contain discernible allusions to the doctrine of rebirth.

The story of the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus is the climax of the drama of initiation as enacted in the Ancient Mysteries. The candidate for initiation was placed on a cruciform lathe. He entered into a trance and performed certain functions, allegorically described as descending into the underworld, or Hades, preaching to the prisoners in Hell, and rising again on the third day. In the Egyptian crypts, the candidate was brought back to life by the sun's rays striking the candidate's head through an aperture in the chamber. After this, Osiris, the Hierophant-Initiator, passed on to him the Sacred Word, and the candidate became the "Anointed of God." The whole drama is shown in the Egyptian bas-reliefs. And the cry of the candidate was not, as shown by J. Ralston Skinner, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" but "My God, my God, how thou dost glorify me." However forsaken the candidate may have felt himself when passing through the "Dark Night of the Soul,"

as some mystics have expressed it, he now knows that he has but to "hold fast to that which has neither substance nor existence" to come safely to the Morning Light.

The biblical story of the birth, crucifixion, resurrection, and Atonement of Jesus becomes clear when it is understood that there are two Selves, or Egos, in man—a higher individuality of God and a lower personality which masks and masquerades as the "self." In theosophical terminology, the terms "higher" and "lower" *manas* are used—the higher pertaining to the spiritual aspect of man, and the lower to its reflection in the desire and sense nature. As H. P. Blavatsky explains:

> The Higher Manas or EGO is essentially divine, and therefore pure; no stain can pollute it, as no punishment can reach it, *per se,* the more so since it is innocent of, and takes no part in, the the deliberate transactions of its Lower Ego. Yet by the very fact that, though dual and during life the Higher is distinct from the Lower, "the Father and Son" *are one,* and because that in reuniting with the parent Ego, the Lower Soul fastens upon and impresses upon it all its bad as well as good actions—both have to suffer, the Higher Ego, though innocent and without blemish, has to bear the punishment of the misdeeds committed by the *lower* Self together with it in their future incarnation. The whole doctrine of atonement is built upon this old esoteric tenet; for the Higher Ego is the antitype of that which is on this earth the type, namely, the personality.

REALIZATION OF THE SELF

The critical social problem of the mystic everywhere is to abide in God, either as a manifestation of God or as God's devotee, and at the same time to abide in phenomenality, as a material, social phenomenon. For the dualist this remains difficult: God and World, for him, are apart. For the non-dualist, however, the difficulty exists only at a preliminary stage of the mystic way, antecedent to realization, since for him, finally, all is found to be in some manner God—as in the words of the Gnostic Thomas Gospel, attributed to Jesus: "I am the All, the All came forth from Me and the All attained to Me. Cleave the wood and I am there; lift up the stone, you will find me there."

—JOSEPH CAMPBELL

WHEN TO EXPECT SPIRITUAL HELP

FOR all men one rule holds good—live the purest and most unselfish life you possibly can—cultivate alike your mind and heart—detach your mind as far as possible from worldly pleasures, worldly desires, worldly objects, and set your heart as undividedly as your strength permits on doing good to all living things. If you thus reach, or have in past lives by similar exertions reached, a certain stage of spiritual awakenment, you will find others more advanced from whom you will receive encouragement and some little help (though in the main each soul has to work out its own road); if you meet none such, then you know that you have not reached the stage at which such encouragement is desirable, and you have only to persevere in the right path, quite sure that in the inexorable sequence of cause and effect that dominates the universe, you will, if not in this, at least in the next life, reach the gateway that leads to the higher life. The way may seem long and weary —but never despair; it leads to the everlasting condition, and to this sooner or later according to your own exertions and deserts *you* will attain, as all men—not utterly destroyed on the way, and these are few (the time of trial comes later)—do likewise attain.

Of what I have said before, let me try to give you an illustration. I am fond of flowers—to those who have worked in certain lines, their beauty and fragrance have higher meanings. I receive a parcel of amaryllis bulbs, destined later to produce some of the loveliest and most gorgeous blooms known, but when received they look like a set of dry, brown scaled coarse onions, not worthy of a second look. Knowing however, their innate capacities, I place them carefully in dry earth in pots and leave them to themselves. I do not water them, for the vital principle in them is still dormant, and were I to try water out of season, to endeavor to stimulate them into premature growth, they would rot—sometimes months and months pass thus and no change, no progress, is discernible, though all the while in their inner tissues, action and reaction are preparing

---

NOTE.—This "extract from a private letter" appeared in the *Theosophist* for September, 1884.

the way for higher development. But one day, in one of them, I discern a tiny green point, pushing its way between the brown scaly skins that cover the sides of the bulb, and then I know that the period of rest is over, and that of activity is commencing, and that I may *now* begin to water without danger, very sparingly at first, but, as the flower stem rises and the great buds begin to show out, with generous hands.

So it is with the soul; its inner actions and reactions must have triumphed over its dormancy, and its spiritual aspirations must have pushed their way out of the dry earth of material associations into the clear air of spirituality before the watchers over the progress of their less advanced brethren can dare to water them, however sparingly, with the water of life.

—P.G.N.

The Disciple Life

In order to have in his turn any title to help, [the aspirant] must work for others, but that must not be his motive for working. He who does not feel irresistibly impelled to serve the Race, whether he himself fails or not, is bound fast by his own personality and cannot progress until he has learned that *the race is himself* and not that body which he now occupies. The ground of this necessity for a pure motive was recently stated in *Lucifer* to be that "unless the intention is entirely unalloyed, the spiritual will transform itself into the psychic, act on the astral plane, and dire results may be produced by it. The powers and forces of animal nature can be equally used by the selfish and revengeful as by the unselfish and all-forgiving; the powers and forces of spirit lend themselves only to the perfectly pure in heart."

—William Q. Judge

letters • questions • comment

It is sometimes said that small children must first learn the meaning of possession before they can understand the meaning of sharing. Is this process a part of developing a truer idea of self?

It could well be so; we live on the plane of contrasts, and it is by discovering their meaning that we learn. Contrast is inherent in the law of cycles. We oscillate between the two poles of spirit and matter. One wonders if the best course would not be to take and maintain a stand in the spiritual, but this becomes possible for the evolving ego only as it learns through experience that spirit is not *anywhere* in particular, that is, in any state or condition, but everywhere. The process is one of taking on embodiment in matter in order to become able to realize and identify with the permanent aspect of experience instead of the transitory.

The child's desire for a possession might be analogous to an adult's desire for some specific condition; in both cases the desire seeks a substitute for the intangible reality, to which, in time, all must learn to cleave. But we must continue the alternating process of involution and evolution until we penetrate the full meaning of all experiences, becoming able to distinguish the real from the unreal. The result of repeated experience and effort is that one finally sees the possibility of taking the position of the warrior, who, as in the *Gita,* goes on and on, regardless of the fortunes of battle. This is eloquently described by Tolstoy in an article printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer*:

> Our life, ever since we became conscious of it, is a pendulum-like motion between two limits.
>
> One limit is, an absolute unconcern for the life of the infinite Universe, an energy directed only toward the gratification of one's own personality.
>
> The other limit is a complete renunciation of that personality, the greatest concern with the life of the infinite Universe, in full accord with it, the transfer of all our desires and good will from one's self, to that infinite Universe and all the creatures outside of us.
>
> The nearer to the first limit, the less life and bliss, the closer

to the second, the more life and bliss. Therefore, man is ever moving from one end to the other, *i.e.*, he lives. THIS MOTION IS LIFE ITSELF.

If all learning is cyclic, how may the discipline of which self-conscious beings are capable contribute to human development?

A passage in *The Secret Doctrine* is suggestive of all the complex phases of evolutionary unfoldment:

> Born in the unfathomable depths of Space, out of the homogeneous Element called the World-Soul, every nucleus of Cosmic matter, suddenly launched into being, begins life under the most hostile circumstances. Through a series of countless ages, it has to conquer for itself a place in the infinitudes. It circles round and round between denser and already fixed bodies, moving by jerks, and pulling towards some given point or centre that attracts it, trying to avoid, like a ship drawn into a channel dotted with reefs and sunken rocks, other bodies that draw and repel it in turn; . . .
>
> And what is there so impossible that a laya centre—a lump of cosmic protoplasm, homogeneous and latent, when suddenly animated or fired up—should rush from its bed in Space and whirl throughout the abysmal depths in order to strengthen its homogeneous organism by an accumulation and addition of differentiated elements? And why should not such a comet settle in life, live, and become an inhabited globe!

If man is the microcosm of the macrocosm, this may be taken as including the basic scheme in which all learning occurs. Might not the path of the comet typify the paths of the incarnating ego, as he again and again moves from homogeneity into heterogeneity, undertaking the task of transmuting the heterogeneous into a homogeneous Element again? These paths are not orderly in the external sense of descending and ascending a ladder. But they might aptly represent the journey of the man as he gathers up unknown and diverse elements of his Karma, having then to mold and refine them into a vehicle stable enough to fulfill his lifetime meditation. If both man and comet are sevenfold beings, this unification does not come from the diverse elements themselves; their diversity provides the means to embody integrating intelligence fittingly. The comet, if it survives, becomes in its turn a planet, its erratic wanderings subjected to the regulation of natural law, its existence supporting the evolution of myriad forms of life. Similarly, a human being, having first assembled the many differentiated elements of his experience, seeks by disciplined ordering of these elements to reflect as much of the vision of the Higher Self as he can.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHEME

SATAN: *The Cosmic Reflection of God*

THE last of the *true* Christians died with the last of the direct apostles. Max Müller forcibly asks: "How can a missionary in such circumstances meet the surprise and questions of his pupils, unless he may point to that seed (referring to the seed planted by Jesus and his apostles), and tell them what Christianity was meant to be? unless he may show that, like all other religions, Christianity too, has had its history; that the Christianity of the nineteenth century is not the Christianity of the middle ages, and that the Christianity of the middle ages was not that of the early Councils; that the Christianity of the early Councils was not that of the Apostles, and that what has been said by Christ, that alone was well said?"

Thus we may infer that the only characteristic difference between modern Christianity and the old heathen faiths is the belief of the former in a personal devil and in hell. "The Aryan nations had no devil," says Max Müller. "Pluto, though of a sombre character, was a very respectable personage; and Loki (the Scandinavian), though a mischievous person, was not a fiend. The German Goddess, Hell, too, like Proserpine, had once seen better days. Thus, when the Germans were indoctrinated with the idea of a real devil, the Semitic Seth, Satan or Diabolus, they treated him in the most good-humored way."

The same may be said of hell. Hades was quite a different place from our region of eternal damnation, and might be termed rather an intermediate state of purification. Neither does the Scandinavian *Hel* or Hela, imply either a state or a place of punishment; for when Frigga, the grief-stricken mother of Bal-dur, the white god, who died and found himself in the dark abodes of the shadows (Hades) sent Hermod, a son of Thor, in quest of her beloved child, the messenger found him in the inexorable region—alas! but still comfortably seated on a rock, and reading a book. The Norse kingdom of the dead is moreover situated in the higher latitudes of the Polar

---

NOTE.—"The Christian Scheme," begun in November, 1967, is collated from the works of H. P. Blavatsky. It recounts the historical background and early development of Christianity.

regions; it is a cold and cheerless abode, and neither the gelid halls of Hela, nor the occupation of Baldur present the least similitude to the blazing hell of eternal fire and the miserable "damned" sinners with which the Church so generously peoples it. No more is it the Egyptian Amenthes, the region of judgment and purification; nor the Onderâh—the abyss of darkness of the Hindus; for even the fallen angels hurled into it by Siva, are allowed by Parabrahma to consider it as an intermediate state, in which an opportunity is afforded them to prepare for higher degrees of purification and redemption from their wretched condition. The Gehenna of the New Testament was a locality outside the walls of Jerusalem; and in mentioning it, Jesus used but an ordinary metaphor. Whence then came the dreary dogma of hell, that Archimedean lever of Christian theology, with which they have succeeded to hold in subjection the numberless millions of Christians for nineteen centuries? Assuredly not from the Jewish Scriptures, and we appeal for corroboration to any well-informed Hebrew scholar.

The only designation of something approaching hell in the Bible is *Gehenna* or Hinnom, a valley near Jerusalem, where was situated Tophet, a place where a fire was perpetually kept for sanitary purposes. The prophet Jeremiah informs us that the Israelites used to sacrifice their children to Moloch-Hercules on that spot; and later we find Christians quietly replacing this divinity by their god of *mercy,* whose wrath will not be appeased, unless the Church sacrifices to him her unbaptized children and sinning sons on the altar of "eternal damnation"!

Whence then did the divine learn so well the conditions of hell, as to actually divide its torments into two kinds, the *pœna damni* and pænæ sensus, the former being the privation of the beatific vision; the latter the *eternal* pains *in a lake of fire and brimstone?* If they answer us that it is in the Apocalypse (20:10), we are prepared to demonstrate whence the theologist John himself derived the idea, "And *the devil* that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where *the beast* and the false prophet are and shall be tormented for ever and ever," he says. Laying aside the esoteric interpretation that the "devil" or tempting demon meant our own earthly body, which after death will surely dissolve in the *fiery* or ethereal elements,[1] the word "eternal" by which our theologians in-

[1] Ether is both *pure* and *impure* fire. The composition of the latter comprises all its visible forms, such as the "correlation of forces"—heat, flame, electricity, etc. The former is the *Spirit* of Fire. The difference is purely alchemical.

terpret the words "for ever and ever" does not exist in the Hebrew language, either as a word or meaning. There is no Hebrew word which properly expresses *eternity; oulam,* according to Le Clerc, only imports a time whose beginning or end is not known. While showing that this word does not mean *infinite* duration, and that in the Old Testament the word *forever* only signifies a long time, Archbishop Tillotson has completely perverted its sense with respect to the idea of hell-torments. According to his doctrine, when Sodom and Gomorrah are said to be suffering "eternal fire," we must understand it only in the sense of that fire not being extinguished till both cities were entirely consumed. But, as to hell-fire the words must be understood in the strictest sense of infinite duration. Such is the decree of the learned divine. For the duration of the punishment of the wicked must be proportionate to the eternal happiness of the righteous.

The Reverend T. Surnden, commenting on the speculations of his predecessors, fills a whole volume with unanswerable arguments, tending to show that the locality *of Hell is in the sun.* We suspect that the reverend speculator had read the Apocalypse in bed, and had the nightmare in consequence. There are two verses in the Revelation of John reading thus: "And the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun, and power was given him to scorch men with fire. And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God." This is simply Pythagorean and kabalistic allegory. The idea is new neither with the above-mentioned author nor with John. Pythagoras placed the "sphere of purification in the sun," which sun, with its sphere, he moreover locates in the middle of the universe, the allegory having a double meaning: 1. Symbolically, the central, spiritual sun, the Supreme Deity. Arrived at this region every soul becomes purified of its sins, and unites itself forever with its spirit, having previously suffered throughout all the lower spheres. 2. By placing the sphere of *visible* fire in the middle of the universe, he simply taught the heliocentric system which appertained to the Mysteries, and was imparted only in the higher degree of initiation. John gives to his Word a purely kabalistic significance, which no "Fathers," except those who belonged to the Neo-platonic school, were able to comprehend. Origen understood it well, having been a pupil of Ammonius Saccas; therefore we see him bravely denying the perpetuity of hell-torments. He maintains that not only men, but even devils (by which term he meant disembodied human sin-

ners), after a certain duration of punishment shall be pardoned and finally restored to heaven. In consequence of this and other such heresies Origen was, as a matter of course, exiled.

Many have been the learned and truly-inspired speculations as to the locality of hell. The most popular were those which placed it in the centre of the earth. At a certain time, however, skeptical doubts which disturbed the placidity of faith in this highly-refreshing doctrine arose in consequence of the meddling scientists of those days. As a Mr. Swinden in our own century observes, the theory was inadmissible because of two objections: 1st, that a fund of fuel or sulphur sufficient to maintain so furious and constant a fire could not be there supposed; and, 2nd, that it must want the nitrous particles in the air to sustain and keep it alive. "And how," says he, "can a fire be eternal, when, by degrees, the whole substance of the earth must be consumed thereby?"

The skeptical gentleman had evidently forgotten that centuries ago St. Augustine solved the difficulty. Have we not the word of this learned divine that hell, nevertheless, *is* in the centre of the earth, for "God supplies the central fire with air *by a miracle*"? The argument is unanswerable, and so we will not seek to upset it.

The Christians were the first to make the existence of Satan a dogma of the Church. And once that she had established it, she had to struggle for over 1,700 years for the repression of a mysterious force which it was her policy to make appear of diabolical origin.

The true esoteric view about "Satan," the opinion held on this subject by the whole philosophic antiquity, is admirably brought out in an appendix, entitled "The Secret of Satan," to the second edition of Dr. A. Kingsford's "Perfect Way." No better and clearer indication of the truth could be offered to the intelligent reader, and it is therefore quoted here at some length:—

1. "And on the seventh day (seventh creation of the Hindus), there went forth from the presence of God a *mighty Angel,* full of wrath and consuming, and God gave him the dominion of the outermost sphere."

2. "Eternity brought forth Time; the Boundless gave birth to Limit; Being descended into generation."[2]

---

[2] When the pure, celestial Being (Dhyan Chohan) and the great Pitris of various classes were commissioned—the one to evolve their images (*Chhaya*), and make of them physical man, the others to inform and thus endow him with divine intelligence and the comprehension of the *Mysteries of Creation.*

4. *"Among the Gods is none like unto him,* into whose hands are committed the kingdoms, the power and the glory of the worlds:"

5. "Thrones and empires, the dynasties of kings,[3] the fall of nations, the birth of churches, the triumph of Time."

For, as is said in Hermes, "Satan is the door-keeper of the *Temple of the King;* he standeth in Solomon's porch; he holdeth *the key of the Sanctuary,* that no man enter therein, save the Anointed having the arcanum of Hermes" (v. 20 and 21).

These suggestive and majestic verses had reference with the ancient Egyptians and other civilized peoples of antiquity to the *creative and generative light of the Logos* (Horus, Brahmâ, Ahura-Mazda, etc., etc., as primeval manifestations of the ever-unmanifested Principle, *e.g.,* Ain-Soph, Parabrahm, or *Zeruana* Akerne—Boundless Time—*Kâla*), but the meaning is now degraded in the Kabala. The "Anointed," who has the secrets and mysteries of Hermes (*Buddha,* Wisdom), and who alone is entrusted with the key to the "Sanctuary," the Womb of nature, in order to fructify it and call to active life and being the whole Kosmos, has become, with the Jews, Jehovah, the "God of generation" on the lunar mountain (Sinai, the mountain of the moon, *"Sin"*). The "Sanctuary" has become the "Holy of Holies," and the arcanum has been anthropomorphised and *phallicised* and dragged down into matter, indeed. Hence arose the necessity of making of the "Dragon of Wisdom," the *Serpent of Genesis*: of the conscious god who needed a body to clothe his too subjective divinity, Satan. But the "innumerable incarnations of Spirit," and "the ceaseless pulse and current of desire" refer, the first one, to our doctrine of Karmic and cyclic rebirths, the second—to EROS, not the later god of material, physiological love, but to the divine desire in the gods, as well as in all nature, to create and give life to Beings. This, the Rays of the one "dark," because invisible and incomprehensible, FLAME could achieve only by themselves descending into matter. Therefore, as continued in the APPENDIX:

12. "Many names hath God given him (Satan), names of mystery, secret and terrible."

13. "The Adversary, because matter opposeth Spirit. Time accuseth even the Saints of the Lord."

28, 29, 31. "Stand in awe of him, and sin not; speak his name

[3] The "dynasties of the kings" who all regard themselves as the "anointed," reigning "by the Grace of God," whereas in truth, they reign by the grace of *matter*, the great *Illusion*, the Deceiver.

with trembling . . . . For Satan is the magistrate of the Justice of God (Karma); he beareth the balance and the sword . . . . For to him *are committed Weight and Measure and Number.*"

Compare the last sentence with what the Rabbi, who explains the Kabala to Prince *Al-Chazari* in the Book of that name, says; and it will be found that the *Weight* and *Measure* and *Number* are, in *Sepher Jezirah,* the attributes of the Sephiroth (the three *Sephrim,* or figures, ciphers) covering the whole collective number of 10; and that the Sephiroth are the collective Adam Kadmon, the "Heavenly Man" or the *Logos.* Thus Satan and the anointed were identified in ancient thought. Therefore,

33. "Satan is the minister of God, Lord of the seven mansions of Hades" . . . .

The seven or *Saptaloka* of the Earth with the Hindus; for Hades, or the Limbo of Illusion, of which theology makes a region bordering on Hell, *is simply our globe, the Earth,* and thus Satan is called—

33 ". . . . the angel of the *manifest Worlds.*"

It is "Satan who is the god of our planet and *the only god,*" and this without any illusive metaphor to its wickedness and depravity. For he is one with the Logos, "the first son, *eldest of the gods,*" in the order of microcosmic (divine) evolution; Saturn (Satan), astronomically, "is the *seventh and last* in the order of macrocosmic emanation, being the circumference of the kingdom of which Phœbus (the light of wisdom, also the Sun) is the centre." The Gnostics were right, then, in calling the Jewish god "an angel of matter," or he who breathed (conscious) life into Adam, and he whose planet was Saturn.

34. "And God hath put a girdle about his loins (the rings of Saturn), and the name of the girdle is Death."

In anthropogony this "girdle" is the human body with its two lower principles, which three die, while the innermost man is immortal. And now we approach the *"Secret* of Satan."

37, 38, 39. ". . . Upon Satan only *is the shame of generation.* He hath lost his virginal estate (so hath the *Kumâra* by incarnating): *uncovering heavenly secrets,* he hath entered into bondage. . . . He compasseth with bonds and limits all things. . . ."

42, 43, 44. "Twain are the armies of God: in heaven the hosts of Michael; in the abyss (the manifested world) the legions of Satan. These are the unmanifest and the manifest; the free and the bound (in matter): the virginal and the fallen. And both are the Ministers

of the Father, fulfilling the word Divine. . . ." Therefore—

55. "Holy is the Sabbath of god: *blessed and sanctified is the name of the Angel of Havas"*—SATAN.

For, "The glory of Satan is the shadow of the Lord": God in the manifested world; "the throne of Satan is the footstool of Adonai"—that footstool being the whole KOSMOS.

When the Church, therefore, curses Satan, it curses the cosmic reflection of God; it anathematizes God made in matter or in the objective; it maledicts God, or the ever-incomprehensible WISDOM, revealing itself as Light and Shadow, good and evil in nature, in the only manner comprehensible to the limited intellect of MAN.

This is the true philosophical and metaphysical interpretation of Samael, or Satan, the adversary in the Kabala; the same tenets and spirit being found in the allegorical interpretations of every other ancient religion.

To make the point clear once for all: that which the clergy of every dogmatic religion—pre-eminently the Christian—points out as Satan, the enemy of God, is in reality, the highest divine Spirit—(occult Wisdom on Earth)—in its naturally antagonistic character to every worldly, evanescent illusion, dogmatic or ecclesiastical religions included. Thus, the Latin Church, intolerant, bigoted and cruel to all who do not choose to be its slaves; the Church which calls itself the bride of Christ, and the trustee at the same time of Peter, to whom the rebuke of the Master "get thee behind me Satan" was justly addressed; and again the Protestant Church which, while calling itself Christian, parodoxically replaces the New Dispensation by the old "Law of Moses" which Christ openly repudiated: both these Churches are fighting against divine Truth, when repudiating and slandering the Dragon of esoteric (because *divine*) Wisdom. Whenever anathematizing the Gnostic Solar Chnouphis—the Agathodæmon—Christos, or the theosophical Serpent of Eternity, or even the Serpent of Genesis—they are moved by the same Spirit of dark fanaticism that moved the Pharisees to curse Jesus by saying to him "Say we not well thou hast a devil?"

Read the account about Indra (Vayu) in the *Rig-Veda*, the occult volume *par excellence* of Aryanism, and then compare it with the same in the Purânas—the exoteric version thereof, and the purposely garbled account of the true Wisdom religion. In the Rig Veda Indra is the highest and greatest of the Gods, and his Soma-drinking is allegorical of his highly spiritual nature. In the Purânas

Indra becomes a profligate, and a regular drunkard on the Soma juice, in the terrestrial way. He is the conqueror of all the "enemies of the gods"—the Daityas, Nâgas (Serpents), Asuras, all the *Serpent*-gods and of Vritri, the Cosmic Serpent. Indra is the St. Michael of the Hindu Pantheon—the chief of the *militant* Host. Turning to the Bible, we find Satan, one of the "Sons of God" (Job. 1:6), becoming in exoteric interpretation the Devil, and the Dragon in its infernal, evil sense. But in the Kabala (*"Book of Numbers"*) Samael, who is Satan, is shown to be identical with St. Michael, the *slayer of the Dragon.* How is this? For it is said that Tselem (the image) reflects alike Michael and Samael *who are one.* Both proceed, it is taught, from *Ruach* (Spirit), *Neschamah* (Soul) and *Nephesch* (life). In the "Chaldean Book of Numbers" Samael is the concealed (occult) Wisdom, and Michael the higher *terrestrial* Wisdom, both emanating from the same source but diverging after their issue from the *mundane soul,* which on Earth is *Mahat* (intellectual understanding), or *Manas* (the seat of Intellect). They diverge, because one (Michael) is *influenced* by Neschamah, while the other (Samael) remains *uninfluenced.* This tenet was perverted by the dogmatic spirit of the Church; which, loathing independent Spirit, uninfluenced by the external form (hence by dogma), forthwith made of Samael-Satan (the most wise and spiritual spirit of all)— the adversary of its anthropomorphic God and sensual physical man, the DEVIL!

on the lookout

The Feeling of Self

A recent paper by Dr. Peter Koestenbaum, a teacher at California State College at San Jose, indicates the presence of a new life in academic philosophy. Illustrating the powerful impact of thinkers like Sartre on modern thought, Dr. Koestenbaum writes:

> Man's feeling of self, his "I-am" experience, the staggering, bewildering realization that he exists—passively in that the world opens itself up to him, and actively in that he creates a living world for himself—is one of man's most emphatic, elevating, and instructive insights. Philosophic self-disclosure in this sense is the basis for understanding Man. . . .

Honoring Self-hood

> That human subjectivity is infinitely precious, and the supreme value is not an arbitrary value-judgment, but a datum of experience. Dignity and worth turn out to be scientifically observed as essential traits of human subjectivity. Thus, the scientific observation and description of human subjectivity discloses it to be the center of Being and the Creator of values. Schweitzer talked of reverence for life as the supreme principle of morality. Existentialism, sharpening and amplifying Schweitzer's intuition, contends that *reverence for subjectivity*, any subjectivity, becomes an automatic concomitant to the correct observation and description of the structure of the world. The world discloses itself to us with subjectivity as its core, and the accurate perception of that core shows it to be of boundless importance. That is the existential foundation for human dignity.
>
> But reverence for subjectivity is not based solely on the centrality of subjectivity. Subjectivity possesses another basic dimension: freedom. In accepting values and world views, man is in essence absolutely free. Man may wish to escape his freedom (*cf.* Fromm's classic, *Escape from Freedom*), but, in actual fact, as Sartre put it, he is condemned to be free. His freedom leads to the anxiety of decision-making and of responsibility by a being who has no recourse beyond his own subjectivity. But absolute freedom leads also to the power and security of knowing that the structure of life is in one's own hands and of his own making.

Man is a god with respect to his own existence. And a god is strong and secure.

The Dignity of Man

The dimension of freedom in human subjectivity is experienced as sacred, a point illustrated by the facts that (*a*) God—man's highest concept—is thought of as Freedom (*i.e.*, a Creator) and (*b*) "God created man in His image" (*i.e.*, as a Free Creator). If one believes in God, then God's essence is being a *Free Creator*. It follows that a Free Creator is the highest value in the universe. Hence the absolute dignity of man. If, on the other hand, one does not believe in God, the same situation obtains nonetheless. God is then the symbol of a Free Creator. Hence, freedom again manifests itself as the highest value of human subjectivity. . . .

That human subjectivity is the center of Being is an observable fact about the world. Even he who disagrees and sees man as but an insignificant homunculus in infinite space and time must admit that such a denigrating picture of himself is self-made, self-imposed, and freely entertained as true by his own subjectivity. That human subjectivity is infinitely valuable is an observed trait of that subjectivity. That human subjectivity is absolutely free in certain areas is another observed fact about the world. And since freedom means creativity, it is the free and creative character of creativity that accounts for its manifestation as a sacred value. Hence the dignity of man.

To Be Is a Choice

The dominant note in the now rapidly spreading Existential viewpoint is the idea of moral responsibility. This is especially characteristic of Jean-Paul Sartre and doubtless accounts for the French thinker's influence on the younger generation. In some of the passages of Sartre's work, it seems as though he has experienced the ethical impact of the conceptions of Karma and Reincarnation, without considering those doctrines themselves. For example, Sartre says in *Being and Nothingness*:

Someone will say, "I did not ask to be born." This is a naïve way of throwing greater emphasis on our facticity. . . . I am ashamed of being born or I am astonished at it or I rejoice over it, or in attempting to get rid of my life I affirm that I live and I assume this life as bad. Thus in a certain sense I *choose* being born. . . . I never encounter anything except my responsibility. That is why I cannot ask, "Why was I born?" or curse the day of my birth or declare that I did not ask to be born, for these various attitudes toward my birth—*i.e.*, toward the *fact* that I realize a presence in the world—are absolutely nothing else but ways

of assuming this birth in full responsibility and of making it *mine*.

This sort of reasoning has enormous intuitive appeal to the dignity-starved youth of the world.

The "Transcenders"

Not unrelated themes recur in the theoretical writings of A. H. Maslow, the Humanist psychologist. In a paper that will appear in a forthcoming book edited by W. G. Bennis and E. H. Schein (McGraw-Hill), Dr. Maslow differentiates among the psychologically healthy people he has called "self-actualizers," naming one group "transcenders." This term is meant to suggest individuals who gain a comprehensive view of human problems by being able, on occasion, to rise above them, and therefore to see more clearly. Dr. Maslow writes:

> . . . transcenders should be more "reconciled with evil" in the sense of understanding its occasional inevitability and necessity in the larger holistic sense, i.e., "from above," in a godlike or Olympian sense. Since this implies a better understanding of it, it should generate *both* a greater compassion with it *and* a less ambivalent and a more unyielding fight against it. This sounds like a paradox, but with a little thought can be seen as not at all self-contradictory. To understand more deeply means, at this level, to have a stronger arm (not a weaker one), to be more decisive, to have less conflict, ambivalence, regret, and thus to act more swiftly, surely and effectively. One can *compassionately* strike down the evil man if this is necessary.

"Loss of Ego"

> I would expect another paradox to be found in transcenders, namely that they are more apt to regard themselves as *carriers* of talent, *instruments* of the transpersonal, temporary custodians so to speak of, *e.g.*, a greater intelligence or skill or leadership or efficiency. This means a certain peculiar kind of objectivity or detachment toward themselves which to non-transcenders might sound like arrogance, grandiosity or even paranoia. The example I find most useful is the attitude of the pregnant mother toward herself and her not-yet-born child. What is self? What is not? How demanding, self-admiring, arrogant does she have a right to be?
>
> I think we would be just as startled by the judgment, "I am the best one for this job and therefore I demand it," as by the equally probable judgment, "You are the best one for this job and therefore it is your duty to take it away from me." Transcendence brings with it the "trans-personal" loss of ego.

Universality of Self

Students of Theosophy are doubtless most familiar with this paradox from noticing the way in which Krishna (in the *Bhagavad-Gita*) sometimes speaks of himself as identical with the Universe or its highest principle. It seems puzzling to find a "man" referring to himself in this way, it not being immediately evident that in these instances he doesn't mean himself as "just a man." Jesus made similar self-references. Dr. Maslow seems to be suggesting that transcendence brings impersonality and universality to the conception of the self.

Interestingly, a New York publisher, Hillary House, recently restored to print an old book on the American Transcendentalists—*Studies in New England Transcendentalism,* by Harold C. Goddard—in which this question is dealt with at length. Dr. Goddard sets the problem in these terms:

> How far were the transcendentalists guilty of intellectual self-sufficiency? How far was their individualism so aggressive as to arouse a natural antagonism?

Source of Self-Reliance

> The belief of these men in the immanence of divinity in humanity gave rise to a sense of "the sufficiency of man for all his functions" and consequently to a doctrine of self-reliance. This philosophy perhaps, or perhaps even more the kind of character on which it was grafted (the implied question we may waive at present), resulted in a certain quality which, though its manifestation in different natures varied greatly, was so fundamentally the same in all that we may almost be justified in calling it "transcendental pride." (Perhaps "pride" is an unsatisfactory word, but there seems to be no better.) These men all believed—with high sincerity—that more than in anything else the amelioration of mankind lay in its gaining their own philosophical attitude toward the world and then in its carrying over that attitude into religion and life. Was it not natural, therefore, that they should have become imbued, just as they did, with a mission to the world? Yet concerning the genuine and fundamental modesty of three of those whom we are treating, Channing, Emerson and Parker, there can certainly be nothing but agreement.

"An Heroic Confidence"

Here Dr. Goddard is wrestling with the paradox of dilemma put very simply by Jasper Niemand in *Letters That Have Helped Me*: "How shall we be proud when we are so small? How dare we be

humble when we are so great? In both we blaspheme." In Dr. Goddard's book, the discussion goes on at length. The following is quoted from Channing:

> No man can be just to himself—can comprehend his own existence, can put forth all his powers with an heroic confidence, can deserve to be the guide and inspirer of other minds—till he has risen to communion with the Supreme Mind; till he feels his filial connection with the Universal Parent; till he regards himself as the recipient and minister of the Infinite Spirit; till he feels his consecration to the ends which religion unfolds; till he rises above human opinion, and is moved by a higher impulse than fame.

"Most Modest of Men"

Of Emerson, Dr. Goddard writes:

> On Emerson's modesty again it is unnecessary to linger; the evidence and the witnesses agree in declaring that he was, what Matthew Arnold called him, "the most modest and least self-flattering of men." . . . He was the last man, too, to try to force his opinion on another. Yet he was the author of the essay on *Self-Reliance,* the preacher of individualism, and often wrote in a style of Delphic finality, which, impersonal as it was, if we did not know the man outside his essays, might lead us to think he was sublimely self-sufficient. . . . It would be idle to contend that he who could enter the following in his Journal did not feel the importance—many will be inclined to say the exaggerated importance—of his mission to the world: "I have . . . slaves to free, . . . imprisoned spirits, imprisoned thoughts . . . which, important to the republic of man, have no watchman or lover or defender but I (*sic*);" though on the other hand it should be remembered that Emerson had too keen a sense of humor to be unconscious of the misunderstanding and ridicule to which his own prophetic role must necessarily subject him: "Empedocles undoubtedly spoke a truth of thought when he said, 'I am a God'; but the moment it was out of his mouth it became a lie to the ear; and the world revenged itself for the seeming arrogance by the good story about his shoe. How can I hope for better hap in my attempts to enunciate spiritual facts?"

Greater than Themselves

Finally, summing up, Dr. Goddard says:

> In all the transcendentalists, then, in varying degrees and kinds, we may observe a common transcendental pride, somewhat of the function of the prophet. All had had what they deemed a spiritual revelation, and all felt called upon to preach it to the world. Alcott and Emerson wrote very frequently in the omniscient style; Margaret Fuller, and even Parker and

> Channing, were not free from a positiveness of utterance sometimes approaching it; while Alcott and Miss Fuller employed it largely in their "conversations." They all showed, in widely different ways, somewhat of the feeling that through them an Absolute Truth greater than themselves was speaking.

A little later, considering Emerson's advocacy (in "Self Reliance") of following "instinct," by which he clearly meant conscience or *spiritual* instinct, Dr. Goddard asks some searching questions:

> But when Emerson goes further, and makes this inner sense not merely a guide to conduct, but a diviner of spiritual truth, then the great majority will not follow, then they say to him, "Your words are jargon to us; you proclaim a thing that does not enter our experience." And who can doubt that the great majority, so speaking, tell the truth? The question then for us is not so much, How far is Emerson's position true? as it is rather, How far, by resting his beliefs on an experience that most mankind does not share, does he show himself thereby impractical? We know what his own answer to that question would have been.

Confirmations to Come

Well, the words Emerson might have used in his answer are not supplied by Dr. Goddard, but one may think that they would have provided a meaning somewhat parallel to what H. P. Blavatsky, anticipating a similar challenge, wrote in her Introductory (xxxvii) to *The Secret Doctrine*:

> As to those who may reject her [the author's] testimony—*i.e.*, the great majority—she will bear them no malice, for they will be as right as she in their way of denying, as she is right in hers in affirming, since they look at TRUTH from two entirely different standpoints. . . . Therefore, the rejection of these teachings may be expected, and must be accepted beforehand. No one styling himself a "scholar," in whatever department of exact science, will be permitted to regard these teachings seriously.

Here, however, the writer (in 1888) added a qualification that could come only from one with deep knowledge of cyclic law:

> They [the teachings] will be derided and rejected *a priori* in this century; but only in this one. For in the twentieth century of our era scholars will begin to recognize that the *Secret Doctrine* has neither been invented not exaggerated, but, on the contrary, simply outlined; and finally, that its teachings antedate the Vedas.

"Conditioned Fullness"

Madame Blavatsky's statement about Space, in philosophical

terms, early in the *Secret Doctrine* (I, 8), that "Space is neither a 'limitless void,' nor a 'conditioned fullness,' but both: being, on the plane of absolute abstraction, the ever-incognizable Deity, which is void only to finite minds, and on that of mayavic perception, the Plenum, the absolute Container of all that is, whether manifested or unmanifested . . ." is recalled by an account (in the *Saturday Review* for Feb. 3, 1962) of a telescope camera's view of two galaxies, NGC 5194 and NGC 5195 (*Hubble Atlas*). Together they are said to form the likeness of a stately, luminous snail suspended in space. "Between the great swirling shell of stars and the glowing head of the snail hangs a filmy bridge of dust which astrophysicists think could be held in place only by magnetic force." The description of this extraordinary feat of modern photography continues:

> The distant sky is filled with suggestions that the cosmos is strung with an invisible net of magnetic lines. Color pictures of the noisiest source of radio waves in the heavens—the Crab nebula—show a knot of blue light wrapped in loops of red cord. The Veil nebula in Cygnus is draped in a soft curve, with ends upward, as though it were falling. But it doesn't fall. It is very plainly girdled in place by a faint spiral of light. Another nebula is bowed like a pair of inviting lips. And many other glittering shapes are entwined in varying degrees of curving regularity.

Interestingly, an editorial note in the *Theosophist* (September, 1883), replying to some questions on cosmic evolution, seems to warn against a too material interpretation of such phenomena. The suggestion is that even though scientists can be justly proud of their achievements in astronomy, they are not yet in a position to grasp the meaning of what they have so carefully observed. The comment is hardly dated, and may easily be applied to discoveries in the present. It continues:

> Verily, and indeed, no microscopes, spectroscopes, telescopes, photometers or other physical apparatuses can ever be focussed on either the *macro-* or *micro*-cosmical highest principles, nor will the *mayavirupa* of either yield its mystery to physical inquiry. The methods of spiritual research and psychological observation are the only efficient agencies to employ. We have to proceed by analogy in everything, to be sure. Yet the candid men of science must very soon find out that it is not sufficient to examine a few stars—a handful of sand, as it were, from the margin of the shoreless cosmic ocean—to conclude that these stars are the same as all other stars—our earth included; that, because they have attained a certain very great telescopic power, and gauged an area enclosed in the smallest of spaces when compared with

> what remains, they have, therefore, concurrently perfected the survey of all that exists within even that limited space. For, in truth, they have done nothing of the kind. They have had only a superficial glance at that which is made visible to them under the present conditions, with *the limited power of their vision.*

Artificial Limb Controlled by Thought

An artificial arm which relies on "thought" for its operation has been developed by a team of physicians and engineers in Boston, Massachusetts (Los Angeles *Times,* Sept. 13, 1968). Although the new limb resembles other artificial arms in appearance, it involves electronic and mechanical components which respond to the neural impulse of the wearer. The arm can be utilized only by an amputee who has suffered no damage to his spinal cord or central nervous system. (With conventional artificial arms, the amputee trains other muscles to operate cables, and cable-tension is used to lift weights; but with the new arm, muscle activation simulates the normal process.)

The Astral Body—the Real Motor Power

The requirement of a healthy central nervous system suggests some sort of relation established with the astral body of the amputee. According to the *Times,* this is how the thought-controlled arm works:

> The wearer thinks to himself, "I want to bend my elbow to lift that telephone receiver to my ear." As with all persons with normal central nervous systems, the signal carrying that message travels from the brain down the spinal cord and to a motor nerve that passes into the biceps muscle of the arm. When the signal reaches the muscle, the muscle contracts. When the muscle contracts another electrical signal distinct from that carried by the nerve is fired by the muscle. It is that signal that the electronic instrumentation inside the artificial arm picks up. The muscle signal is picked up by electrodes which are in surface contact with the biceps muscle. The signal is amplified and used to control an electric motor that powers the arm into action. The electric motor is powered by a battery worn on the amputee's belt.

The astral body, it is said, is electrical and magnetic in its constitution and characteristics. It would appear to be the medium through which the energizing power of thought is converted into the impulse which stimulates matter on this plane—in this instance the motorized components of the artificial arm.

Recognition of the Astral Body—a Growing Necessity

The developers of the new arm are cautious in claiming full success for the new limb, which is regarded as still in an experimental stage, yet to the Theosophist it inevitably suggests consideration of the astral body, a principle whose independence of the physical is a fundamental tenet of the occult sciences. As *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 149) says: "The whole issue of the quarrel between the profane and the esoteric sciences depends upon the belief in, and demonstration of, the existence of an astral body within the physical."

Danger from Noise

According to a study by the Federal Council for Science and Technology, prolonged exposure to intense noise, in addition to causing permanent hearing loss, may "adversely affect other organic, sensory and physiognomical functions of the human body." (*New York Times,* Nov. 10, 1968.) Similar work in Germany has uncovered other health hazards connected with noise. Research disclosed "an abnormally high number of abnormal heart rhythms in steelworkers exposed to severe noise at work." Further: "Italian weavers, also exposed to intense noise, have shown abnormal brain wave patterns, some of them suggestive of personality disorders."

Aimless Speed

Writing in the *American Scholar* (Summer, 1968) on a parallel subject, Joseph Wood Krutch sees an alarming invasion of privacy in the deluge of unsolicited mail, phone calls, and advertising to which we are subjected against our will. Then, speaking of sonic booms caused by ever larger and faster jet transports, he observes:

> The nerve- and window-shattering racket they would create is an absurd price to pay for the possibility of getting from New York to San Francisco in a few hours less time than today's jets consume. Who needs these few hours as much as the inhabitants living along the route need what is left of their peace and quiet? And actually, of course, even the time to be saved isn't much if measured in terms, not of flight time, but of total elapsed time from home or office in New York to the final destination on the West Coast.

Public Apathy

Commenting on the claim of public officials that noise and pollution are necessary accompaniments to progress, Mr. Krutch adds:

> It is not merely General Maxwell and Dr. von Gierke, it is

all the people—and that may well mean a large proportion of our population—who have tacitly accepted the assumption that science and technology do not exist in order to make it possible for human beings to live better, but that human beings must make whatever sacrifices are necessary to advance science and technology for their own sakes. They think not only that things are in the saddle and ride mankind, but that this is just as it should be. These are the people who accept without reservation the "because it is there" philosophy—and this philosophy includes the belief that whatever we can do we should do—or all those who are "not goal-oriented" (and again I have to thank Marshall McLuhan for calling by his approval my attention to a very significant phrase) but believe it more important to move fast than to know where we are going.

The Principle of Growth

This spiritless submission to almost systematic psychic and psychological mutilation—here called "invasion of privacy"—may be equated with indifference to egoity, to that part of us on which all human growth depends. In the same issue of *American Scholar,* in an article called "America the Unimagining," Benjamin DeMott goes more deeply into the temper of modern life:

> Commentators by the hundred score the country for garishness, gross materialism, unspirituality; few focus on the poverty of its conception of growth. Yet that is the fairer target. The nation prates of self-realization, and rests in near obliviousness that my humanness depends upon my capacity and my desire to make real to myself the inward life, the subjective reality, of the lives that are lived beyond me. The nation feeds itself on rhetoric about "individual rates of progress"—and yet possesses little knowledge, if any, of the steps by which the human being becomes itself, the acts of the imagination on which the achievement of personhood depends.

Self-Knowledge the Key

In 1890, in her article "Progress and Culture," H. P. Blavatsky declared the principle from which all such criticism gains its philosophical foundation. "Real culture," she said, "is spiritual." "It proceeds from within outwards, and unless a person is naturally noble-minded and strives to progress on the spiritual before he does so on the physical or outward plane, such culture and civilization will be no better than whitened sepulchres full of dead men's bones and decay." From a comparison of this statement with most present-day criticisms of material progress, it is obvious that H.P.B. assigned primary importance to recognition of the reality of the inner man.

For it is only this idea of individual centers of spiritual causation that is lacking in Mr. DeMott's excellent account of psychological growth. And if the products of technology do not come into being in response to the needs of the inner man, in his efforts to "make real to [himself] the inward life, the subjective reality, of the lives that are lived beyond [him]," or in harmony with the efforts to "Act for and as the Self of all creatures"—then we will neither know nor have those outer things that are good for the whole man. Her article continues:

> The progress we have achieved, so far, relates in every case to purely physical appliances, to objects and things, not to the *inner* man. We have now every convenience and comfort of life, everything that panders to our senses and vanity, but not one atom of moral improvement do we find in Christendom since the establishment of the religion of Christ. As the cowl does not make the monk, so the renunciation of the old Gods has not made men any better than they were before, but only, perhaps, worse. At any rate, it has created a new form of hypocrisy—cant; nor has civilization spread as much as is claimed for it. London is civilized, but in truth—only in the West-end. As to the East-end with its squalid population, and its desolate wilderness of Whitechapel, Limehouse, Stepney, etc., it is as uncultured and almost as barbarous as Europe was in the early centuries of our era, and its denizens, moreover, have acquired a form of brutality quite unknown to those early ages, and never dreamt of by the worst savages or modern heathen nations. And it is the same in every Christian metropolis, in every town and city; outward polish, inward roughness and rottenness—a Dead Sea fruit indeed!